DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 663 CS 504 146

AUTHOR Ambler, Bob
TITLE A Comparison of the Interpersonal Orientations of Speech Anxious and Non Speech Anxious Students.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Speech Communication Association (Orlando, FL, April 6-9, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Affective Behavior; *Anxiety; College Students; *Communication Apprehension; Communication Research; *Comparative Analysis; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Competence; *Interpersonal Relationship; Questionnaires

ABSTRACT

A special section of a public speaking class at the Universtiy of Tennessee was developed in the spring of 1977 for speech anxious students. The course was designed to incorporate the basic spirit of the regular classes and to provide special training in techniques for reducing nervousness about speaking and in methods for coping with the nervousness experienced while giving a speech. During 1981, students at the beginning of each quarter were administered a questionnaire (FIRO-B) that was found useful as a tool for developing insight concerning the students' interpersonal communication behaviors in another course on interpersonal communication. The questionnaire was based on a theory of interpersonal behavior that posits three different dimensions of ways in which people need or want to relate to other people: inclusion, control, and affection. Each of these need areas includes both an expressed and a wanted component. Comparisons between the expressed and wanted scores on each of the three need areas showed that all subgroups (male and female, nonspeech anxious and speech anxious) wanted more affection than they expressed, but this was particularly true for the females of the speech anxious groups. Furthermore, the speech anxious groups, but not the nonspeech anxious groups, wanted a higher level of control than was expressed. Finally, there were no significant differences between expressed and wanted inclusion for any of the groups, though the difference for speech anxious females approached significance, with the expressed scores being slightly higher than the wanted scores for that group. The data in the study suggest that speech anxious students are characterized by an aversion to, or evasion of, control behavior. The interpersonal orientations of these students, then, present special implications to the speech teacher for developing appropriate anxiety-relieving teaching strategies. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED228663

A COMPARISON OF THE INTERPERSONAL ORIENTATIONS OF SPEECH ANXIOUS AND NON SPEECH ANXIOUS STUDENTS

By
Bob Ambler
Department of Speech and Theatre
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Presented to the "Research in Speech Education" at the 1983 Annual Convention of the Southern Speech Communication Association in Orlando, Florida, April 6-9, 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bob Ambler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS506446

Over the past decade, concern for a special group of students who have difficulty with the communication process has emerged in the Speech Communication field. Special instructional strategies and programs have been developped for what has been classified as stage fright, communication apprehension, communication anxiety, reticence, speech anxiety, and shyness.[1] While the symptoms and helping strategies for persons whose behaviors and attitudes might generally fall within the list above may and probably should vary, it is nevertheless true that they have in common a tendency to avoid communicating at least in some specific situation because of perceived punishments related to the act of communication. The programs for instructional improvement have varied at the several schools at which they have developped, at least in part because of the type of student for which the program was designed to serve, as well as the nature of the rest of the curriculum into which the specialized program must fit. By the same token, procedures for identifying and notifying students for whom the specialized courses or programs would be appropriate also vary.[2] Paper and pencil tests (most frequently some form of the PRCA) and announcement of a specialized program program followed by instructor interviews are two of the most popular means of selecting students for enrollment into specialized classes for communication avoidant students.[3]

One ramification of the varying nature of the selection process is that the communication orientations of students in different programs may vary considerably, necessitating the plication of different instructional strategies for helping a particular group of students in a given program. The purpose of this paper is to present results concerning the communication orientations of students in a class for communication avoidant students at our school, the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, and to examine the implication of the students' communication orientations for instructional strategies. Specifically, the paper will examine the differences between FIRO-B[4] scores for students who have been selected for a special communication avoidant class and students who are enrolled in the regular section of the course; both are sections of a large multi-sectioned basic speech course in public speaking. Since the instructional program mentioned in this study focuses on public speaking anxiety, the discussion section will compare the results obtained with a previous report of communication orientations in an instructional program that focussed on reticence.[5]

CONTEXT AND SETTING

The Public Speaking class at the University of Tennessee is a large multi-sectioned course which serves the curricular requirements of a number of colleges, including Agriculture, Business, Communication, Education, and Home Economics. The course focuses on developping the ability to prepare and present an oral presentation before an audience, and students are required to present

at least three graded speeches to the class. In the Spring of 1977, a special section of this class was developped for "Speech Anxious" (SA) students.[6] The course was designed to incorporate the basic spirit of the regular classes, but to in addition provide special training in techniques for reducing nervousness about speaking and in methods for coping with the nervousness experienced while giving a speech. Ultimately, the goal is that students dev elop greater confidence and competence in performing the skills necessary for presenting an effective oral presentation. The course was designed to accomodate students who were required to take the public speaking class as part of their curriculum, but whose excessive fear of the public speaking situation would reduce their liklihood of completing the course. Since the specialized program supports a public speaking course, concern has been with speech anxiety as opposed to reticence or other difficulties more related to the interpersonal level of communication, and while our special section for speech anxious students probably includes a certain percentage of students who are reticent or more generally apprehensive about communication, there is also a substantial number of students entering the class who report that they feel comfortable about communicating in most other situations than giving a speech. This fact has prompted a change from the PRCA (Personal Report of Communication Apprehension) to the PRPSA (Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety) as a means of measuring the effectiveness of our training since the items included on the PRPSA seem to have greater face validity for the context of its use.[7]

Students in the special section of the public speaking class either self identify themselves during the preregistration period for the subsequent quarter (the class is designated in the timetable of classes for registration/preregistration as being for speech anxious students only) or they are identified by the PRPSA, which all students in the regular sections of the class take and self score on the first day of the term. In the latter case, students with higher scores are advised to consider enrollment in the special section for speech anxious students (though they may stay with the regular section). In any case, a student enrolling in the special section class is required to obtain the instructor's permission. The instructor of the special section class[8] attempts to screen students to assure the appropriateness of the class for the student. The instructor makes a subjective judgment (based on his discussion with the student) as to whether the student is indeed "speech anxious" or whether he/she is seeking enrollment in the class for inappropriate reasons, i.e., supposed ease of the class.

METHODS AND DESIGN

During the last year, 1981, I decided to begin administering the FIRO-B questionnaire at the first of the quarter in the special section for speech anxious students. Another instructor and I had found the FIRO-B particularly useful as a tool for developping insight concerning one's interpersonal communication behaviors in another course (Interpersonal Communication) and felt that it might have potential for some diagnostic work in the

special section of the public speaking class. The initial results using the FIRO-B in the SA public speaking class yielded results that were interesting because of their comparisons with averages we had found in the interpersonal communication class. I reasoned, however, that the comparison with the scores from the interpersonal communication class would not be as appropriate a comparison as one with students from the regular section of the public speaking class since the former is not a required course for as many of the students in the class. Consequently, I have continued to administer the FIRO-B at the first of the quarter for the special SA public Speaking class, and students enrolled in the regular sections of the class during the Summer of 1981 were asked to complete the FIRO-B. This yielded 105 completed questionnaires (46 males and 59 females). The data for the special section class is based on the completion of the FIRO-B by 96 students (45 males and 51 females) who were enrolled during the Winter, Spring, and Fall quarters of 1981 in the special SA public speaking class.

Prior to presenting these results, a word of explanation about the FIRO-B is in order. The FIRO-B is based on William Schutz's theory of interpersonal behavior, which posits that there are three different dimensions or ways in which we need or relate to other people: (1) Inclusion, (2) Control, and (3) Affection.[9] We need to be part of a group, we need to influence and be influenced by others, and we need to love and be loved. Each of these need areas includes both an expressed and a wanted component, the latter being less manifest than the

expressed area. Consequently, the test yields six different scores, each of which can vary from a low of 0 (representing very little of the stated need) to a high of 9 (representing a large amount of the stated need): (1) Expressed Inclusion, i.e., "I try to be with people", (2) Wanted Inclusion, i.e., "I like other people to invite me to things", (3) Expressed Control, i.e., "I take charge of things when I'm with people", (4) Wanted Control, i.e., "I am easily led by people", (5) Expressed Affection, i.e., "I try to get close and personal with people", and (6) Wanted Affection, i.e., "I like people to act close toward me".

No a priori predictions about differences between non speech anxious students and speech anxious students were hypothesized, but the same comparisons which Rosenfeld and Frandsen had made in comparing the FIRO-B scores of reticent versus non-reticent students were conducted.[10] They had predicted that non-reticent students would score higher than reticent students on all dimensions of the FIRO-B, that reticents would want more control than they express, and that reticents would want more affection than they express. As in the Rosenfeld and Frandsen study, independent t tests were used to compare each dimension (expressed inclusion, wanted inclusion, expressed control, wanted control, expressed affection, and wanted affection) of the FIRO-B. Dependent t tests (t test for paired differences) were used to compare the expressed against the wanted needs for inclusion, control, and affection for both speech anxious and non speech anxious students. Unlike the Rosenfeld and Frandsen study, though, all comparisons were conducted separately for male and female students.

RESULTS

Table 1 compares the means of the FIRO-B scores for the regular sections of the public speaking class and the special SA public speaking sections. These are broken down into means for male and female students since our previous work with the FIRO-B in the interpersonal communication class had suggested sex differences on the measure. Such differences are also suggested by the normative data which Schutz presents for male and female high school students.[11]

TABLE 1

MEAN FIRO-B SCORES FOR NON SPEECH ANXIOUS AND SPEECH ANXIOUS STUDENTS AT UTK

FIRO-B SCALE	Public Speaking Regular Sections		Public Speaking Anxiety Sections	
	Males (n=46)	Females (n=59)	Males (n=45)	Females (n=51)
Expressed Inclusion	4.24	4.59	3.69	4.92
Wanted Inclusion	4.02	4.10	3.96	4.04
Expressed Control	3.50	2.97	1.69	1.76
Wanted Control	2.59	2.46	3.58	3.16
Expressed Affection	3.52	3.92	3.02	3.84
Wanted Affection	4.72	5.51	4.69	5.82

Results of the t comparisons between means as shown in Table 1 are presented in Tables 2, 3, and 4. Table 2 presents the comparisons for the total group (both male and female), while Tables 3 and 4 presents the results for males and females, respectively.

TABLE 2

COMPARISONS OF FIRO-B SCALE SCORES:
NON SPEECH ANXIOUS AND SPEECH ANXIOUS STUDENTS
(TOTAL GROUP: MALES AND FEMALES)

A. Independent t Comparisons for Total Group (N=201)

EI_{nsa} vs. EI^{1}_{sa} = .323		WC_{nsa} vs. WC_{sa} = -2.806**	
WI_{nsa} vs. WI_{sa} = .147		EA_{nsa} vs. EA_{sa} = .851	
EC_{nsa} vs. EC_{sa} = 4.261***		WA_{nsa} vs. WA_{sa} = - .378	

B. Dependent t Comparisons for Total Group

EI_{nsa} vs. WI^{2}_{nsa} = 1.307		EI_{sa} vs. WI_{sa} = 1.030	
EC_{nsa} vs. WC_{nsa} = 2.070*		EC_{sa} vs. WC_{sa} = -4.848***	
EA_{nsa} vs. WA_{nsa} = -6.280***		EA_{sa} vs. WA_{sa} = -7.583***	

[1]To be read: "expressed inclusion of non speech anxious compared with expressed inclusion of speech anxious."
[2]To be read: "expressed inclusion of non speech anxious compared with wanted inclusion of non speech anxious."
*p<.05
**p<.01
***p<.001

TABLE 3

COMPARISONS OF FIRO-B SCALE SCORES:
NON SPEECH ANXIOUS AND SPEECH ANXIOUS STUDENTS
(MALES ONLY)

A. Independent t Comparisons for Males (N=91)

EI_{nsa} vs. EI^{1}_{sa} = 1.120		WC_{nsa} vs. WC_{sa} = -2.134*	
WI_{nsa} vs. WI_{sa} = .087		EA_{nsa} vs. EA_{sa} = .986	
EC_{nsa} vs. EC_{sa} = 3.787***		WA_{nsa} vs. WA_{sa} = .055	

B. Dependent t Comparisons for Males

EI_{nsa} vs. WI^{2}_{nsa} = .546		EI_{sa} vs. WI_{sa} = - .560	
EC_{nsa} vs. WC_{nsa} = 1.889		EC_{sa} vs. WC_{sa} = -3.795***	
EA_{nsa} vs. WA_{nsa} = -3.210**		EA_{sa} vs. WA_{sa} = -4.530***	

[1]To be read: "expressed inclusion of non speech anxious compared with expressed inclusion of speech anxious."
[2]To be read: "expressed inclusion of non speech anxious compared with wanted inclusion of non speech anxious."
*p<.05
**p<.01
***p<.001

TABLE 4

COMPARISONS OF FIRO-B SCALE SCORES:
NON SPEECH ANXIOUS AND SPEECH ANXIOUS STUDENTS
(FEMALES ONLY)

A. Independent t Comparisons for Females (N=110)

EI_{nsa} vs. EI^{1}_{sa}	= - .861	WC_{nsa} vs. WC_{sa}	= -1.783
WI_{nsa} vs. WI_{sa}	= .090	EA_{nsa} vs. EA_{sa}	= .184
EC_{nsa} vs. EC_{sa}	= 2.456*	WA_{nsa} vs. WA_{sa}	= - .717

B. Dependent t Comparisons for Females

EI_{nsa} vs. WI^{2}_{nsa}	= 1.223	EI_{sa} vs. WI_{sa}	= 1.926
EC_{nsa} vs. WC_{nsa}	= 1.116	EC_{sa} vs. WC_{sa}	= -3.059**
EA_{nsa} vs. WA_{nsa}	= -5.712***	EA_{sa} vs. WA_{sa}	= -6.287***

[1] To be read: "expressed inclusion of non speech anxious compared with expressed inclusion of speech anxious."
[2] To be read: "expressed inclusion of non speech anxious compared with wanted inclusion of non speech anxious."
*p<.05
**p<.01
***p<.001

A perusal of Tables 2, 3, and 4 shows that the only dimensions of the FIRO-B on which non speech anxious and speech anxious students differ are the expressed control and wanted control dimensions. Note, however, that while both expressed and wanted control differed significantly between the two groups for the males, the females only approached significance on the wanted control comparison ($t = -1.783$; $df = 108$; $p < .10$). Reference to the means for the different groups in Table 1 demonstrates that speech anxious students have higher wanted control scores and lower expressed control scores. These differences appear to be greater for the males than for the females.

Comparisons between expressed and wanted scores on each of the three need areas showed that all subgroups (male and female, non speech anxious and speech anxious) wanted more affection than they expressed, but this was particularly true for the females for the speech anxious groupings. The speech anxious groups, but not the non speech anxious ones, wanted a higher level of control than was expressed. Finally, there were no significant differences between expressed and wanted inclusion for any of the groups though the difference for speech anxious females approached significance ($t = 1.926$; $df = 49$; $p < .10$), with the expressed scores being slightly higher than the wanted scores for that group.

DISCUSSION

The results of the present study are in some ways consistent with the findings of Rosenfeld and Frandsen's comparison of reticent and non-reticent students on the FIRO-B. (See Table 5 for

comparison of overall means between studies.) In both studies,

TABLE 5

MEAN FIRO-B SCORES FOR STUDENTS IN PRESENT STUDY AND ROSENFELD-FRANDSEN STUDY

	Ambler (1982) (Comparing Public Speaking Anxiety)		Rosenfeld-Frandsen (1972) (Comparing Levels of Reticence)	
FIRO-B SCALE	Regular Public Speaking Students (N=105)	Speech Anxious Students (N=96)	Non-Reticent Students (N=58)	Reticent Students (N=38)
Expressed Inclusion	4.44	4.34	5.79	3.24
Wanted Inclusion	4.07	4.00	5.50	3.21
Expressed Control	3.20	1.73	3.45	2.00
Wanted Control	2.51	3.35	4.92	5.16
Expressed Affection	3.74	3.46	4.18	1.76
Wanted Affection	5.16	5.29	5.03	3.95

the "communication avoidant" group wanted more control than they expressed, while the comparison group did not. In both studies, the "communication avoidant" group wanted more affection than they expressed to a greater extent than the comparison group. In both studies, "communication avoidant" students expressed less control than the comparison group.

There the similarities end, since Rosenfeld and Frandsen found that their reticent students expressed less inclusion and affection than non-reticents as well as wanted less inclusion than non-reticents. No such difference in inclusion and affection scores (expressed or wanted) emerged in comparing non speech anxious and speech anxious students. In fact, it should be noted

that differences between inclusion and affection scores for reticents and non-reticents were large enough that Rosenfeld and Frandsen felt justified in using a combination of the expressed inclusion and expressed affection score (but not expressed control) as a potential identification measure for reticent students.[12] On the contrary, the results of the present study would suggest that the expressed and wanted control dimensions of the FIRO-B would be better predictors of speech anxious students. It is, of course, necessary to keep in mind that these results were derived from different types of programs. There is every reason to believe that Rosenfeld and Frandsen's "reticent" students were quite different from our "speech anxious" students. It seems likely that Rosenfeld and Frandsen's reticents and non-reticents are each more homogeneous groups (Note the means in Table 5). While the exact selection process they used is not clearly stated, their article implies a highly selective process for assigning reticents to their special classes. Note also in Table 5 that their non-reticent group expresses and wants more inclusion than our non speech anxious students by almost a point and a half while their reticents expressed and wanted less inclusion than our speech anxious students. This reflects the possibility of a more highly selective process for discovering the "communication avoidant" students for special classes, but it also suggests that their non-reticent group was assigned more selectively. The process of defining the non speech anxious group not only was not selective (students in the regular sections of the public speaking class were simply asked to complete the measure), but there are some reasons to believe that there may

have been at least a few students in the sample who might otherwise have been in the special section for speech anxious students. The reason for this is that the sample was taken during the Summer quarter, and this is the quarter in which our school does not offer a special section of the public speaking class for speech anxious students due to limited enrollment. In other quarters when the speech anxiety class is being offered, there are students who report high speech anxiety (as measured by the PRPSA) and, who for one reason or another choose to stay with the regular section of the class, and do complete it successfully. Thus, given the fact that there was no special section option, there may well have been and probably was a higher percentage of speech anxious students mixed in the group the present study has been referring to as the regular section group. This is a methodological difficulty which can be resolved by collecting the FIRO-B data during a quarter in which the speech anxiety class is being offerred, and this is what the author of this paper is attempting to do at the present time. Still, the overall figures for the Rosenfeld and Frandsen non-reticent group is much larger than for the non speech anxious group, which leads one to believe that the non-reticent group may have been more than a random draw from a basic communication course, but rather a group that was picked on some other criterion for being obviously non-reticent.

The results of the present study, combined with the Rosenfeld and Frandsen study, would tend to suggest that in a program where the primary concern in dealing with communication avoidance is with public speaking, the control dimension of the FIRO-B may be

a more important predictor of whether a person is qualified for the program, while in a program where a broader range of communication avoidance behaviors are the concern, the expressed inclusion and affection scores are better predictors of qualification for the program. One way of testing this general hypothesis would be to compare scores on the FIRO-B with scores on measures of public speaking anxiety (such as the PRPSA) and with scores on more general measures of communication apprehension (such as the PRCA-24[13] without the public speaking items) with a population that exhibits a broad range of scores on the different measures. If the hypothesis suggested is valid, then public speaking anxiety should be more related to the control scores on the FIRO-B, specifically smaller expressed scores and larger wanted control scores, and communication apprehension, or similar tests of interpersonal avoidance or apprehension, should be more related to the inclusion and affection dimensions than is the measure of public speaking anxiety. Again, the author of this paper is attempting to collect such data at the present time.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING

Let us assume that, as the data in this study suggests, persons with high public speaking anxiety are characterized by orientations toward other people in which they don't attempt to influence others very much, and would prefer that others influence them. If this is the case, are there implications for the way in which we as speech teachers relate to the highly speech anxious student? I believe the answer is a definite yes. Allow me to elaborate. Speech anxious students have a difficulty with the

public speaking situation at least partially because the situation is one that commands attention; it is a position of power. Speech anxious students don't see themselves as exercising control effectively, and since this situation in which they have been placed is by its very nature a position of influence, they are quite naturally uncomfortable. The position is inconsistent with any of the interpersonal rhetorical strategies which they have developped to navigate interpersonal transactions. Being low in expressed control, they don't care to tell anybody what to do. This makes the situation where they are asked to deliver a persuasive speech (as opposed to an informative speech) especially difficult (even to find a topic).

So what do we as speech teachers do for the speech anxious person whose anxiety is at least partially due to an aversion and evasion of control behavior? I have no ultimate answers to this question, but I do think that there is a general strategy which can be employed: spend a good deal more time on the topic selection process than you would for the average student and emphasize the importance of selecting a topic for which you as a speaker have a good feel. Obviously, this is a recommendation which most of us would make to any of our students, but I think it is especially important for some of our speech anxious students and needs to be underscored. I mention these ideas not only because I think they have worked for my students as much as for the fact that they have worked for me. In taking the FIRO-B, I find myself to be low on expressed control, and I also feel that I am speech anxious, at least to some degree. I am not crazy about telling other

people what to do; I don't even really like participating on convention programs. So what I have to do is to convince myself that the effort is a worthwhile effort which should be done regardless of any external reward or punishment system. Right now, I think the ideas I'm dealing with are worthwhile, but there are a lot of other research projects I could do and have done in the past that would or did just fizzle out and allowed me to avoid the situation. Thus, I try to share my experiences with my students as I'm trying to share them with you. But what I try to do is to let them know that I've got some strategies which work to some degree for me in certain situations and encourage them to at least try them. I don't treat my answers as their answers, but encourage the students to look to others beyond myself and the experts for answers with the idea that they will get their answers about what works best for them in preparing and delivering a speech from many sources.

Similarly, I think it is important that the student recognize her/his tendencies and preference in relating to other people and how these may affect her/his thinking, feeling, and behaviors in all the activities which are required to give an effective oral presentation. In this sense, a speech teacher can use the FIRO-B not only as a diagnostic tool, but as an insight tool which will allow the student to see better how personal orientations may keep her/him in a continual pattern of avoiding certain activities like giving a speech without being aware of it. What I have done in the past, and not as effectively as I would like to do, is to ask the students to take the FIRO-B at the first of the course, and then later, after I have scored the test, hand it back to them

and discuss its implications to the process of preparing for and presenting an oral presentation. It is important in this process that the appropriate kinds of reservations about test scores be made (they may tell you something about yourself, but they may not), but I have found that this kind of insight about one's communication coupled with a discussion of the way one's own self talk contributes to anxiety and performance can be immensely helpful to at least a portion of the students in my special section class.

In summary, I think it is vital that we remember that the different programs at various colleges and universities which are designed to help students with communication difficulties do not relate to the same population of students. This is at least partially because they operate in a different social and curricular structure, and it is a good bit because the programs have different goals and therefore will tend to identify different types of students to help. This is very important because what works well in one program will not necessarily work well in another program, and what works well with one student will not necessarily work well with the next student. Similarly, one program's strengths will be another program's weaknesses. We cannot do everything, but if we combine our efforts and recognize the value of other people's experiences as well as our own, I'm convinced we'll go a lot further than we ever though we could.

NOTES

[1]See for example Gerald M. Phillips (ed.), "The Practical Teachers' Symposium on Shyness, Communication Apprehension, Reticence, and a Variety of Other Common Problems," Communication Education, 29 (1980) 213-263, and Gerald M. Phillips (ed.), "Coming of Age in the Academy: A Symposium," Communication Education, 31 (1982) 177-223.

[2]Differences in procedures for identifying communication avoidant students for the different programs are reported in the Symposium in the July, 1982 issue of Communication Education by Jan Hoffman and Jo Sprague, "A Survey of Reticence and Communication Apprehension Treatment Programs at U.S. Colleges and Universities," Communication Education, 31 (1982) 185-193 and Karen A. Foss, "Communication Apprehension: Resources for the Instructor," Communication Education, 31 (1982) 195-203.

[3]Hoffman and Sprague, 1982, 187 and Foss, 1982, 196-197.

[4]The FIRO-B (Fundamental Interpersonal Relationship Orientation-Behaviors) is a test devised by William C. Schutz, The Interpersonal Underworld (Palo Alto, Calif.: Science and Behavior Books, 1966), which is designed to examine the extent of a person's needs for other people in several different areas. The general nature of the test is described later in this paper (pp. 5-6).

[5]Lawrence B. Rosenfeld and Kenneth D. Frandsen, "The 'Other' Speech Student: An Empirical Analysis of Some Interpersonal Relations Orientations of the Reticent Student," The Speech Teacher, 21 (1972) 296-302.

[6]This special section of our public speaking class for speech anxious students is described in more detail in Bob Ambler, "The Speech Anxiety Program at UTK: A Training Program for Students with High Public Speaking Anxiety," Paper to be presented at the Speech Communication Association Annual Meeting, Louisville, Kentucky, November 4, 1982.

[7]The PRPSA and the initial version of the PRCA for college students can be found in James C. McCroskey, "Measures of Communication-Bound Anxiety," Speech Monographs, 37 (1970) 269-277.

[8]The author of this paper is and has been the instructor of the special section of public speaking for speech anxious students since its initiation in the Spring of 1977. In that sense, the program is very much like most of those reported by Hoffman and Sprague, 1982, 187, which are directed by a single faculty member.

[9]Schutz, 1966.

[10]Rosenfeld and Frandsen, 1972, pp. 298-299.

[11]Will Schutz, FIRO Awareness Scales Manual (Palo Alto, Calif.: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1978).

[12]Rosenfeld and Frandsen, 1972, pp. 300-302.

[13]James C. McCroskey and Virginia P. Richmond, The Quiet Ones: Communication Apprehension and Shyness (Dubuque, Iowa: Gorsuch-Scarisbrick, 1980).